

THE EFFECT OF MARKETING MIX (4P) ON PERCEIVED VALUE, TRUST, PURCHASE, AND REPURCHASE DECISIONS USING SEM TOOLS

Sajidah Tiara Ayu Wiranda¹

Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia
20032010060@student.upnjatim.ac.id

Minto Waluyo²

Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jawa Timur, Surabaya, Indonesia
mintow.ti@upnjatim.ac.id



Abstract

The rapidly evolving business landscape, particularly in manufacturing and service sectors, demands effective marketing strategies to secure a competitive edge and sustain market presence. This paper focuses on the chemical industry, exemplified by CV Rizqy Anhu Kemala, which faces challenges such as product quality dissatisfaction and increased competition. The study explores the impact of the 4P marketing mix—Product, Price, Promotion, Place—on perceived consumer value, trust, and repurchasing decisions. By collecting questionnaire data and applying Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), the research aims to provide insights. The findings show that the relationship between the independent variable product (X1) has a positive effect on perceived value, price (X2) does not have a positive effect on perceived value, promotion (X3) and location (X4) cannot be proven because these variables are excluded. While the perceived value attachment variable (Y) has a positive and significant effect on trust.

Keywords: Marketing Mix 4P, Perceived Value, Purchase Decision, SEM, Trust

INTRODUCTION

The dynamic development of the business sector in various industries highlights the need for comprehensive economic and technological progress. Companies strive to achieve excellence by implementing effective marketing strategies (Putri et al., 2024). The main controllable marketing elements include product, price, place, and promotion (Yonanda et al., 2023).

The product is a determining variable in business activities, where the better it is, the more consumers will buy again. Price is the value that consumers exchange for owning a product. Promotion is an effort to help introduce products to the public, where promotions are currently intensively carried out through social media. The competitiveness of a product is very important (Arif et al., 2022), in addition to meeting customer expectations (Tjiptono in Rahayu, 2021). Pricing reflects perceived value (Fakhrudin et al., 2022), influencing consumer trust (Rahmawati in Wardani & Manullu, 2021). Affordable pricing increases product acceptance (Rahayu, 2021). Promotional product introduction activities require persuasive techniques while maintaining customer comfort (Hazrah et al., 2024).

One of the industries that is experiencing tough competitor challenges is CV Risqy Anhu Kemala, which provides various types of chemicals. Products provided in regular stock such as methanol, oxalic acid, dishwashing soap, floor scale cleaner, and fragrance. Along with the increasing number of industries, competition between companies is getting tighter. In solving the problem of CV Risqy Anhu Kemala regarding the number of competitors and unaffordable prices, this study solves it with a 4P marketing mix approach (Product, Price, Promotion, Place) to determine the level of perceived value, trust, purchase decision, and repeat purchase using the help of SEM tools. This study is not only to determine the effect of exogenous variables on endogenous variables, but can also provide knowledge to CV Risqy Anhu Kemala in implementing the 4P marketing mix so that this can improve performance and maintain its position as the best chemical provider and be able to win the market.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Effective marketing management is essential for all businesses (Satriadi et al., 2021), which involves strategic planning and direction (Maharini et al., 2024). Marketing plays an

important role in delivering products or services, increasing customer appeal (Suprayanto et al., 2021). The marketing mix helps achieve consumer confidence in making purchases (Asmin et al., 2021), adjusting prices and promotional spending (Muzani et al., 2023). Influential factors include product nature, life cycle, funds, and level of competition. The 4P mix includes product, price, promotion, and location (Isfanyah et al., 2022).

The value perceived by consumers, which is the assessment of repeat purchases, includes cost, where the cheaper it is, the more often consumers will buy the product. Other assessment criteria include the alignment of product function with price, price-quality ratio, and alignment of quality with price (Stefanie et al., 2023). Customer feedback informs quality and price improvements. Perceived value indicators include functionality, value for money, emotion, social influence, and novelty. Good quality will build customer confidence to buy the product again (Rifai, 2023).

Purchasing decisions arise from trust and confidence, which encourage customers to continue using the product. Based on research (Suryadarma et al., 2023) and (Stefanie et al., 2023) that product quality must be improved to become a plus point for the company in competing with competitors. Internal factors that influence include product type, brand, and type of seller (Suryadarma et al., 2023). External factors include competition between sales and sales efficiency. Repeat purchases reflect consumer confidence in the product.

Validity is a measure that shows the reliability or validity of a measuring instrument. Validity is also commonly interpreted as a condition that describes the level of the instrument in question that can measure what will be measured (Machali, 2021). Reliability is often also interpreted as consistency or constancy, accuracy, stability, and reliability. A research instrument has a high level of value of reliability if the test results of the instrument are consistent or have consistent towards something to be measured. One of the software programs in the test measurement is SEM. SEM helps analyze with construction (Y) and measurable variables (X), assessing causality through measurement and structural models. The measurement model establishes dimensional indicators, while the structural model analyzes relational causality (Waluyo et al., 2023).

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was conducted at CV Risqy Anhu Kemala, Jl. Tidar No. 110 A, Surabaya, involving 100 people in filling out the questionnaire, who were consumers of CV Risqy Anhu Kemala. The sampling method used in this study is non-probability sampling using purposive sampling techniques with the criteria of having purchased products at CV Risqy Anhu Kemala. The questionnaire was selected based on a Likert scale of 1-5 in the hope of providing more detailed information. Independent variables include: product (quality, packaging, and diversity), price (suitability to quality, comparison with competitors, and affordable prices), promotion (sales promotion, direct promotion, and social media accuracy), and location (location access, parking, and visibility). The dependent variables: perceived value (emotional and functional), trust (integrity, competence), purchasing decisions (product selection, buying based on needs, payment methods), and repeat purchases (making repeat purchases, recommendations to people, and not wanting to switch brands). These questions will be processed using SEM assistance and will determine the level of effectiveness of sales promotions so far.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The questionnaire used a Likert scale of 1-5. SEM was used to select the sampling assumption using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) technique.

Measurement Model Test

The measurement model is a critical stage where we evaluate the model's fit through various goodness-of-fit indices and cut-off values. At this point, the goal is to determine the extent to which the hypothesized model aligns with the sample data. The Measurement Model is a phase where the model's compatibility is assessed by examining various goodness of fit options and defined cut-off value criteria. The primary goal here is to ascertain the degree to which the proposed model aligns with the sample data. Unfortunately, the model fails to adequately represent the latent variables. Analyzing goodness of fit and cut-off value at $df = 202$ with a 0.05 significance level showcases that, The results of this test with the Goodness of Fit and Cut off Value values are Chi-square = 386, 384; probability level = 0.000; CMIN/DF = 1.913; RMSEA = 0.096; GFI = 0.748; AGFI = 0.656; TLI = 0.79; and CFI = 0.832. From this test, it is known that only CMIN/DF is a good criterion. The validity

and reliability tests show that all indicators are valid and reliable, while the correlation test shows that there is a significant relationship. This will result in multicollinearity. According to (Waluyo & Rachman, 2024) multicollinearity is a state of strong correlation between exogenous variables in the model. However, according to (Budi et al., 2024), there is an alternative to overcome the problem of multicollinearity in the model, namely by removing variables that have a high correlation or by increasing the number of observations. Variable X3 has a significant correlation with a high correlation value, so it is necessary to remove the variable. After removing the variable X3, it was found that there were still exogenous variables that had a high correlation value, namely in variable X4. So, the researcher retested and obtained a smaller correlation result than before. The results of the measurement model after X4 were removed. For the Goodness of Fit and Cut off Value values obtained Chi-square = 154.924; probability level = 0.000; CMIN/DF = 1.741; RMSEA = 0.086; GFI = 0.837; AGFI = 0.751; TLI = 0.807; and CFI = 0.908. From the test, it is known that only CMIN/DF is a good criterion. For the validity and reliability test, it shows that all indicators are valid and reliable, while for the correlation test, a smaller value was obtained than before, so that the analysis is continued because if other variables are removed again, it will affect the purpose of the study.

Each indicator exhibits a critical ratio (CR) exceeding twice the standard error (2.SE), confirming that they fulfill the necessary validity criteria. This means all indicators in the model are valid in measuring their respective variables. With degrees of freedom (df) set at 23 for all indicators and a 0.05 significance level, the t-table value reaches 1.714. The test results confirm the significance of all model indicators. In a correlation test, the exogenous variable significantly correlated with a high value in the X3 variable, recorded at 1.006, signaling potential multicollinearity issues. Thus, it's advisable to remove the X3 variable to obtain a lower chi-square value, improving goodness of fit.

Once the X3 variable was excluded, measurements showed the model's goodness of fit values and cut-off values at $df = 149$ with the 0.05 significance level remained aligned solely with the CMIN/DF criteria. Through validity and significance testing with a t-value at a 0.05 significance level and $df = 20$ (including all indicators), a value of 1.725 affirmed the validity and significance of all indicators. The removal of the X3 variable established a strong relation with a high value of 0.930 for the X4 variable. Therefore, eliminating the X4 variable

is also recommended to lower the chi-square value at a goodness of fit. Omitting X4 is essential since retaining it prevents the structural model in AMOS from being measurable.

Upon removing X4, results indicated that only the CMIN/DF criteria fulfilled the required goodness of fit and cut-off value conditions at $df = 89$ with a 0.05 significance level. With validity and significance assessment at a 0.05 significance level and $df = 16$ (for all remaining indicators), a 1.746 value was obtained, ensuring all indicators retained their validity and significance. After the removal of X4, the correlation coefficient (r) between exogenous variables was reduced compared to previous calculations. Consequently, variables X3 and X4 were omitted from the structural model measurement.

Structural Model Measurement

In the measurement model, it still produces a goodness of fit value that is not yet appropriate, so it is continued in the structural model process solely to obtain the modification index value that will be used in the model modification stage. If the goodness of fit results of the measurement model are not good, then the results of the structural model are certainly not good either. This can be proven that the probability results in this measurement are still less than 0.05, which is 0.00. Therefore, the structural model needs to be modified. In modifying the model, start with the largest number in the modification index. The results of the model test results compared to the critical values in the table above show that there are only two criteria that have good criteria or can be said to meet the expected standards, namely CMIN/DF and RMSEA, while the other criteria are not good or can be said to not meet the standards. does not meet the expected standards. The results of the structural model test obtained the Goodness of Fit and Cut off Value results, namely the Chi-square value = 186.847; probability level = 0.000; CMIN / DF = 2.009; RMSEA = 0.101; GFI = 0.82; AGFI = 0.737; TLI = 0.831; Finance = 0.869. Comparison of the model test value with its critical value obtained only CMIN / DF and RMSEA, which meet the criteria. Therefore, the structural model needs to be modified.

Tabel 1
Covariances Modification Indices

		M.I.	Par Change
z1 <-->	z2	22,386	,049
e16 <-->	e20	7,095	-,068
e15 <-->	z3	5,784	,065
e15 <-->	e20	4,794	,094

		M.I.	Par Change
e15 <-->	e19	8,193	-,098
e13 <-->	z3	5,016	-,062
e13 <-->	e20	7,064	,117
e11 <-->	e14	5,379	,074
e6 <-->	z1	5,705	,042
e6 <-->	e16	4,791	-,033
e5 <-->	e15	4,728	,092
e4 <-->	z1	4,272	,050
e4 <-->	e16	5,624	,050
e3 <-->	z2	5,154	,025
e3 <-->	z3	4,030	-,039
e1 <-->	z3	11,190	,077
e1 <-->	e12	10,528	,086

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

Modification Model

Tabel 2
Goodness of Fit dan Cut off Value Modification Model

Criteria	Model Testing	Critical Value	Description
X ² Chi-Square	88,777	Small, X ² with df = 83 with $\alpha = 0.05$	Good
Probability	0,455	$\geq 0,05$	Good
CMIN/DF	1,009	$\leq 2,00$	Good
RMSEA	0,1	$\leq 0,08$	Good
GFI	0,909	$\geq 0,90$	Marginal
AGFI	0,851	$\geq 0,90$	Good
TLI	0,998	$\geq 0,95$	Good
CFI	0,999	$\geq 0,95$	Good

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The output of the modified model in the table above shows that all criteria have good values except for AGFI, which has a marginal value (approaching good). Because all criteria have met the critical values that have been set, the model can be said to be fit. Based on the table above with the results of Chi-square = 88.777; probability level = 0.455; CMIN/DF = 1.009; RMSEA = 0.1; GFI = 0.909; AGFI = 0.851; TLI = 0.998; CFI = 0.999. The results of the model modification test value compared to its critical value, it was found that all criteria were good except for the GFI criterion, which was close to good (marginal).

Tabel 3
Validity Modification Model Test

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	2.SE	P	Valid Information	Significant Information	Estimate Standardized Regression Weights
Y1	<---	X1	0,707	0,22	3,213	0,44	0,001	Valid	Significant	0,529
Y1	<---	X2	0,411	0,292	1,405	0,584	0,16	Valid	Not Significant	0,222
Y2	<---	X1	0,417	0,185	2,257	0,37	0,024	Valid	Significant	0,319
Y2	<---	X2	0,94	0,285	3,296	0,57	***	Valid	Significant	0,519
Y2	<---	Y1	0,321	0,113	2,855	0,226	0,004	Valid	Significant	0,329
Y3	<---	X1	1,276	0,706	1,808	1,412	0,071	Valid	Significant	0,837
Y3	<---	X2	3,023	1,303	2,32	2,606	0,02	Not Valid	Significant	1,432
Y3	<---	Y2	-1,524	0,899	- 1,694	1,798	0,09	Not Valid	Not Significant	-1,307
Y4	<---	X1	1,009	0,241	4,192	0,482	***	Valid	Significant	0,75
Y4	<---	X2	0,818	0,412	1,987	0,824	0,047	Valid	Significant	0,439
Y4	<---	Y3	-0,078	0,156	- 0,501	0,312	0,617	Not Valid	Not Significant	-0,089
X1.1	<---	X1	1,616	0,3	5,395	0,6	***	Valid	Significant	0,853
X1.2	<---	X1	1,211	0,253	4,782	0,506	***	Valid	Significant	0,645
X1.3	<---	X1	1							0,561
X2.1	<---	X2	2,193	0,524	4,183	1,048	***	Valid	Significant	0,89
X2.2	<---	X2	1,601	0,448	3,57	0,896	***	Valid	Significant	0,526
X2.3	<---	X2	1							0,426
Y1.1	<---	Y1	1,139	0,171	6,644	0,342	***	Valid	Significant	0,812
Y1.2	<---	Y1	1							0,708
Y2.1	<---	Y2	1							0,807
Y2.2	<---	Y2	1,092	0,111	9,884	0,222	***	Valid	Significant	0,848
Y3.1	<---	Y3	0,555	0,153	3,631	0,306	***	Valid	Significant	0,453
Y3.2	<---	Y3	0,932	0,184	5,081	0,368	***	Valid	Significant	0,696
Y3.3	<---	Y3	1							0,678
Y4.1	<---	Y4	1							0,807
Y4.2	<---	Y4	1,072	0,141	7,588	0,282	***	Valid	Significant	0,692
Y4.3	<---	Y4	0,999	0,164	6,078	0,328	***	Valid	Significant	0,569

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

The validity test is assessed from the modification of the model developed in the study to ensure that each estimated indicator can validly represent the measured variable. Each indicator is said to be valid if the C.R. value > 2.SE. In this study, there are three invalid variables, namely, variables X2 (Price) and Y2 (Trust) are invalid in measuring variable Y3

(Purchase Decision), and variable Y3 (Purchase Decision) is invalid in measuring variable Y4 (Repeat Purchase). For each indicator, it can be seen that it is valid to measure the dimensions being measured. A variable can be said to be significant if the critical ratio (CR) value is greater than the t-table ($t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$). The t value at a significance level of 0.05 with $df = 16$ (total number of indicators) is 1.746. Based on the results of the comparison of t-count with t-table in the table above, it can be concluded that the indicators above are latent variable dimensions that are formed significantly.

Tabel 4
Reliability Modification Model Test

Variable	Product		Price		Perceived Value		Trust		Buying Decision		Repeat Purchase	
Indicator	Construct	Error	Construct	Error	Construct	Error	Construct	Error	Construct	Error	Construct	Error
X1.1	0,853	0,147										
X1.2	0,645	0,355										
X1.3	0,561	0,439										
X2.1			0,89	0,11								
X2.2			0,526	0,474								
X2.3			0,426	0,574								
Y1.1					0,812	0,188						
Y1.2					0,708	0,292						
Y2.1							0,807	0,193				
Y2.2							0,848	0,152				
Y3.1									0,453	0,547		
Y3.2									0,696	0,304		
Y3.3									0,678	0,322		
Y4.1											0,807	0,193
Y4.2											0,692	0,308
Y4.3											0,569	0,431
ΣStd. Error	2,059		1,842		1,52		1,655		1,827		1,499	
ΣError		0,941		1,158		0,48		0,345		1,173		0,501
Reliability Construct	0,818356635	0,745548416	0,827981651	0,888133203	0,739964872	0,817685656						
Description	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable	Reliable

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

After the suitability of the model is tested and its validity is measured, the next step is to measure the reliability of each indicator. This is to show that in a model, the indicators used have a good level of suitability, stability, consistency, and accuracy. A construct is said to be reliable if its reliability value is $\alpha \geq 0.70$. However, in exploratory research, a reliability

of 0.5 - 0.6 is acceptable. Table 4 shows that all indicators are reliable, with construct reliability results ≥ 0.70 .

In the validity and reliability test, all variables and indicators are valid and reliable, except that variables X2 (Price) and Y2 (Trust) are not valid in measuring variable Y3 (Purchase Decision), and variable Y3 (Purchase Decision) is not valid in measuring variable Y4 (Repeat Purchase). And the results of the model interpretation are obtained, which can be seen in the Standardized Residual Covariance output in the modification model, which shows that the residual value is optimal because it is in the residual value range of $-2.58 \leq \text{residual} \leq 2.58$.

Tabel 5
Standardized Residual Covariance Model Test

	Y4.3	Y4.2	Y4.1	Y2.2	Y2.1	Y3.1	Y3.2	Y3.3	Y1.1	Y1.2	X2.1	X2.2	X2.3	X1.1	X1.2	X1.3
Y4.3	-,123															
Y4.2	-,166	-,002														
Y4.1	-,034	-,281	-,002													
Y2.2	,654	,150	-,225	,038												
Y2.1	-1,190	,619	-,079	-,079	,027											
Y3.1	-,049	-1,635	-,498	,559	-1,010	,037										
Y3.2	,051	,916	,394	,135	,796	,416	,079									
Y3.3	,092	,234	-,473	-,176	-,981	,064	-,414	,042								
Y1.1	-,778	-,297	,627	,099	-,245	-,251	,682	-,937	,006							
Y1.2	-,771	-,747	,462	,323	,464	,267	,425	-1,166	,007	,226						
X2.1	,623	-,253	-,069	,100	,062	,550	,074	,474	,140	,289	-,011					
X2.2	,178	-,483	-,262	,621	,268	,182	-,346	-,725	,391	,350	-,191	,005				
X2.3	,036	,121	-,213	,055	1,225	-,023	-,118	-,626	,685	,543	-,351	,771	,000			
X1.1	-,501	-,351	,214	-,225	,086	-1,244	,814	,049	-,535	-,114	-,247	-,588	1,217	,000		
X1.2	-,266	-,263	-,277	-,513	,653	-,171	,367	-,777	,340	,337	-,647	-,127	1,276	,211	,000	
X1.3	-,507	,755	,222	,212	,429	,796	,575	-,499	,776	,068	,556	,656	1,536	,037	,333	,214

Source: Processed primary data, 2024

If the developed model has been estimated, but has a large model estimation result and is still in the residual value range of $-2.58 \leq \text{residual} \leq 2.58$, then the modification can be stopped. The results of the Standardized Residual Covariance test of the modified model show that the residual value is optimal because it is in the residual value range of $-2.58 \leq \text{residual} \leq 2.58$.

$$Y4 = 0.732X1 + 0.380X2 + Z6$$

Based on the results of the simultaneous equation above, it can be seen that CV Risqy Anhu Kemala must improve product quality based on this insight. It can be concluded that CV Risqy Anhu Kemala is still able to produce significant equations in its business process, even though the Promotion (X3) and Location (X4) variables have been removed. In addition,

the results of the simultaneous equations indicate that CV Risqy Anhu Kemala exists and is able to compete in the market because it produces simultaneous equations with the regression coefficient figures of the products made and the prices set are promising in the market.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that: 1. Product (X1) significantly affects perceived value (Y1), while Price (X2) does not significantly affect perceived value (Y2), excluding promotion and location variables. 2. Only product (X1) and price (X2) maintain significant influence on trust (Y2), while promotion and location variables are removed in the test. 3. Perceived value (Y1) increases trust (Y2). 4. Product (X1) and price (X2) have a significant impact on purchase decision (Y3), excluding promotion and location variables. 5. On the contrary, trust (Y2) has a negative impact on purchase decision (Y3). 6. Both product (X1) and price (X2) have a positive influence on repeat purchase (Y4), while promotion and location testing do not show any significance. 7. Purchase decision (Y3) is negatively correlated with repeat purchase (Y4).

REFERENCES

- Arif, M., Tanjung, I. S., & Nasution, N. A. (2022). Purchasing Decisions Based on Marketing Mix in Halal Certification Moderation. *Journal of Economics and Business*. Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 174 – 184.
- Asmin, A. E., Syam, A. H., Kapriani., Normiyati., Sujatmiko., Sitaniapessy, R. H., Sudirman, A., Agustinah, F., Ansari., Zulaikha., Hafipah., Wardhana, A., & Sumarsih. (2021). Bandung: Media Sains Indonesia.
- Fakhrudin, A., Roellyanti, M. V., & Awan. (2022). *Marketing Mix*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.
- Hazrah, S., Rahmani, N. A. B., & Aisyah, S. (2024). Effectiveness of Product Quality, Packaging, Price, and Sales Location of A-Zaki Tempe in Encouraging Consumer Repurchase Interest in Kisaran City. *Journal of Islamic Management and Finance*. Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 50 – 69.
- Maharini, S. & Musnaini. 2024. The Effect of Marketing Mix (Product, Price, Promotion & Place) on Consumer Purchase Interest in Jambi Night Market. *Journal of Applied Management and Finance*. Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 229 – 242.
- Muzani, A., Arifah, U., & Aliefah, A. N. (2023). Marketing Mix Analysis in an Effort to Increase Sales Volume of Home Industry Cassava Chips Ayu in Banjareja According to Islamic Economic Perspective. *Journal of Management, Economics, and Entrepreneur*. Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 157 – 182.

- Putri, A. C. A., Oetarjo, M., & Yani, M. (2024). The Effectiveness of Marketing Mix Strategy in Increasing Sales of Medical Device Products at CV Mulya Jaya Sidoarjo. *Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting*. Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 10599 – 10607.
- Rahayu, S. (2021). The Influence of Price, Trust and Product Quality on Purchasing Decisions of Tokopedia E-commerce Users (Case Study on Informatics Management Students Class of 2020, Mahakarya Asia University PSDKU Baturaja). *Journal of Management, Business, and Accounting*. Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 40 – 50.
- Rezfajri, M., Kurnia, D. P., & Suyono. (2021). The Effect of Product, And Price on Purchase Decision and Customer Loyalty at PT. Mura Maha Agung Employees. *Applied Business Journal*. Vol. 1, No. 1, Pages 62 – 73.
- Rifai, K. (2023). *Consumer Satisfaction*. Jember: UIN Khas Press.
- Satriadi., Wanawir., Hendrayani, E., Siwiyanti, L., & Nursaidah. (2021). *Marketing Management*. Yogyakarta: Samudra Biru.
- Stefanie & Hasan, G. (2023). The Influence of Service Quality, Perceived Value, Brand Image, Price Fairness and Trust on Brand Loyalty in Boba Drinks in Batam City. *Management Studies and Entrepreneurship Journal*. Vol. 4, No. 1, Pages 657 – 672.
- Suryadarma, M. A. & Aulia, P. (2023). The Influence of Promotion Mix on Product Purchasing Decisions at Shopee Food in Bandung City. *Journal of Business Economics*. Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 659 – 666.
- Waluyo, M. & Rachman, M. (2024). *Easy, Fast, and Accurate in Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Applications*. Malang: PT Literasi Nusantara Abadi Group.
- Yonanda, A., Arizal., Heri, H. (2023). Marketing Mix, Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing Decisions and Its Implementation on Customer Loyalty in Traditional Market MSMEs in Pantai Village, Kuantan Singingi Regency. *South East Asian Management Concern*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 1 – 11.